

**REMARKS**

**Status of the claims:**

With the above amendments, claim 7 has been canceled and claims 1, 3-6 and 8-12 have been amended. Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-13 are pending and ready for further action on the merits. No new matter has been added by way of the above amendments. The claims have been amended simply to make them clearer. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

**Examiner Interview**

Applicants and Applicants' representative would like to thank the Examiner for meeting with Applicants' representative on July 8, 2003. More particularly, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for suggesting claim language to make the claims allowable.

**Specification**

The Examiner has objected to the specification as not providing antecedent support for the phrase in the claims "wherein the wt% is relative to the weight of the weight of the first outermost layer and the second outermost layer added together". Applicants have amended claim 1 to omit this phrase from claim 1. It is believed that with this omission that the

objection has been obviated. Withdrawal of the objection is warranted and respectfully requested.

**Rejections under 35 USC §112, first paragraph**

Claims 1 and 3-13 are rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as allegedly lacking written description for inserting "new matter". The Examiner asserts that the phrase "wherein the wt% is relative to the weight of the weight of the first outermost layer and the second outermost layer added together" is new matter. Applicants have amended claim 1 to omit this phrase. Applicants believe that with this change that the rejection has been obviated. Withdrawal of the rejection is warranted and respectfully requested.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1 and 3-13 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph for reciting "and" as appears in the passage below:

*the first outermost layer on the first side contains a polymer latex in an amount of 50 wt% or more of the total binder contained in the first outermost layer on the first side and the second outermost layer on the second side contains a polymer latex in an amount of 50 wt% or more of the total binder contained in the second outermost layer on the second side.*

Applicants have amended the above passage to recite

*the outermost layer on the first side contains a polymer latex in an amount of 50 wt% or more of the total binder contained in the outermost layer on the first side or the outermost layer on the second side contains a polymer latex*

*in an amount of 50 wt% or more of the total binder contained in the outermost layer on the second side.*

It is believed that with this change that the rejection has been obviated as support for this language can be found at page 3, lines 14-16 and lines 20-33. Withdrawal of the rejection is warranted and respectfully requested.

**Rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph**

Claims 1 and 3-13 are rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. The Examiner asserts that it is unknown what is the scope of the phrase "wherein the wt% is relative to the weight of the first outermost layer and the second outermost layer added together". Applicants have amended claim 1 to omit this phrase. Thus, the rejection is moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is warranted and respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-13 are also rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph for reciting the phrase "common monomer". In the interview held with the Examiner on July 8, 2003, Applicants' representative and the Examiner agreed that by "common" this meant the "same". Applicants believe that with this explanation that the rejection has been obviated. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that the claims, as they now stand, define patentable subject matter

such that passage of the instant invention to allowance is warranted. A Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If any questions remain regarding the above matters, please contact Applicant's representative, T. Benjamin Schroeder (Reg. No. 50,990), in the Washington metropolitan area at the phone number listed below.

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant respectfully petitions for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application. The required fee of \$110.00 is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By Marc S. Weiner (Reg. No. 40,069)  
Marc S. Weiner, #32,181

MSW/TBS/mua

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000